



Docket No.: 219625US99DIV

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231

OBLON  
SPIVAK  
McCLELLAND  
MAIER  
&  
NEUSTADT  
P.C.  

---

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

RECEIVED  
OCT 11 2002  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/076,450  
Applicants: JAMAL RAMDANI ET AL  
Filing Date: February 19, 2002  
For: SEMICONDUCTOR STRUCTURE,  
SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE, COMMUNICATING  
DEVICE, INTEGRATED CIRCUIT, AND  
PROCESS FOR FABRICATING THE SAME  
Group Art Unit: 2815  
Examiner: BAUMEISTER

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

**RESTRICTION RESPONSE**

Our check in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Richard L. Treanor  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 36,379



22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)

DOCKET NO.: 219625US99DIV

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF: GROUP ART UNIT: 2815  
JAMAL RAMDANI ET AL :  
SERIAL NO.: 10/076,450 EXAMINER: BAUMEISTER  
FILED: FEBRUARY 19, 2002 :

FOR: SEMICONDUCTOR STRUCTURE, SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE,  
COMMUNICATING DEVICE, INTEGRATED CIRCUIT, AND PROCESS FOR  
FABRICATING THE SAME

RESTRICTION RESPONSE

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231

SIR:

Responsive to the Restriction Requirement dated September 11, 2002, Applicants  
elect Group I, Claims 144-153, 158, 178-182, and 233-235

REMARKS

The claims in this case were restricted into three Groups. Applicants have  
provisionally elected Group I, Claims 144-153, 158, 178-182, and 233-235.

The Office Letter characterizes Group III and the remaining two Groups of claims as  
being related as "process of making and product made." Referring to MPEP §806.05(f), the  
Office Letter takes the position that a bonding/substrate removal step can be used instead of  
epitaxial growth. While not taking a position with regard to the Examiner's comments,  
Applicants submit that the statement in the Office Letter does not meet the requirements set  
out in MPEP §806.05(f).

In this case there is no explanation in the Restriction Requirement as to why the  
proposed alternative would be a *materially different* process, as that term is used in the MPEP  
to support Restriction, nor is there an explanation as to how or why the proposed alternative



#cf  
Decker  
J. McAllister  
10/15/02

RECEIVED  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800  
OCT 11 2002